

MR 7 1973 Read this Post WG story while waiting as long as I could for the Times, which did not come today. You can judge when you read this if it includes anything I should know. I think that while this reporting is fair, the inferences drawn may be unfair. We may not like the lawyers present but that is not improper. We may feel that they should not have restrained what people would tell the FBI, but that is their obligation to their client(s), esp. if there is the basis for criminal charges. Rather than being a legitimate complaint against the lawyers, I take this as a legitimate inference that the lawyers knew there had been criminality and were for that reason, not the fear of that reason, exercising restraints. That Gray would send such stuff to Dean is incredible in view of the FBI's alleged devotion to protection of its sources. He fingered them and exposed them to retaliation. This may also indicate perjury by Magruder. If so, the Post doesn't say. Quote of Mrs McC points to wide knowledge of projects. Also interesting that the Post identifies sources inside GOPs, not named. More unusual than such sources talking to FBI. If some don't have to worry about futures, the Dem's civil suit might be much more interesting than thus far indicated. HW 3/6/73

13 Mar 73

The "Post WG story" to which your note was attached is Bernstein/Woodward, "FBI Says GOP Unit Hurt Case," Wx Post 6 Mar 73. We had difficulty with your second sentence, which we finally interpreted to mean that when we got the NYTimes for that date, we could judge whether it included anything you should know, not covered in the Post story.

NYTimes for 6, 7 Mar came yesterday. That for the 6th had only the Crewdson story on Gray's speech in Cleveland. That for the 7th deals with lawyers being present at FBI interviews, and does include some things not in the Post story of the 6th. NYTimes for both days attached.

Je